AO 472 (Rev. 09/08) Detention Order Pending Trial - MIWD (Rev. 10/09) Case 1:11-cr-00245-RHB ECF No. 12 filed 09/28/11 Page ID.18 Page 1 of 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

United States of America	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL		
v. Jonathan Hale Davis <sub>Defendant</sub>	Case No. 1:11-cr-00245-RHB		
After conducting a detention hearing under the Bai hat the defendant be detained pending trial.	il Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require		
Part I	- Findings of Fact		
	bed in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has previously been convicted of nse that would have been a federal offense if federal jurisdiction had		
a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C which the prison term is 10 years or more.	s. § 3156(a)(4), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for		
an offense for which the maximum senten	ce is death or life imprisonment.		
an offense for which a maximum prison te	rm of ten years or more is prescribed in:		
a felony committed after the defendant had U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable	d been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 state or local offenses.		
any felony that is not a crime of violence b a minor victim the possession or use of a fire a failure to register under 18 U	earm or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon		
<u>——</u>	ted while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state		
(3) A period of less than 5 years has elapsed since offense described in finding (1).	the date of conviction defendant's release from prison for the		
	, (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition will reasonably assure the safety of another e community. I further find that defendant has not rebutted that presumption.		
Alter	native Findings (A)		
(1) There is probable cause to believe that the defer	ndant has committed an offense		
for which a maximum prison term of ten ye Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 80′ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).			
(2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption will reasonably assure the defendant's appearant	established by finding (1) that no condition or combination of conditions are and the safety of the community.		
✓ (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not			
(2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will end	danger the safety of another person or the community.		
Part II – Statemer	nt of the Reasons for Detention		
I find that the testimony and information submitted evidence a preponderance of the evidence that:  1. Defendant waived his detention hearing, electing not to	at the detention hearing establishes by clear and convincing		

## ad of the continuing determent to the court o attention once

2. Defendant has been in state custody and would not be released in any case.

3. Defendant may bring the issue of his continuing detention to the court's attention should his circumstances change.

## Part III – Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or a designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.

Date:	September 28, 2011	Judge's Signature:	/s/ Ellen S. Carmody
		Name and Title:	Ellen S. Carmody, U.S. Magistrate Judge